REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-19, 21, 22, 24-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1-7, 12-19, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,820,075) in view of Goodwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,592); rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Goodwin et al. and Ortega et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,213); rejected claims 30 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Ortega et al.; rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al.; rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Veale (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,470); rejected claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Veale and Ortega et al.; and rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Goodwin et al. and Risvik (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,945).

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 7, 9-12, 18, 26-31, 41, 43, and 44 to improve form, and add new claim 45. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7, 9-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 41, and 43-45 are pending.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-19, 21, 22, 24-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to address the Examiner's concerns. Claim 1 (and

corresponding dependent claims 2-6, 12-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, and 29) are clearly directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 7, 9-11, and 26 have been amended to depend from a claim other than claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7, 9-11, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-19, 21, 22, 24-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON SHANAHAN ET AL. AND GOODWIN ET AL.

In paragraphs 7 and 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 12-19, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Goodwin et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1, for example, is directed to a method, performed by one or more server or client devices, that comprises obtaining, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, a text fragment; performing, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, a search, based, at least in part, on the text fragment, to identify one or more documents; identifying, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, sentences within the one or more documents that include the text fragment; determining, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, sentence endings as text that is located within the identified sentences between the text fragment and an end of the identified sentences; assigning, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a location within the identified sentences at which the text fragment occurs; and outputting, using a

processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, the sentence endings as potential completions for the text fragment based, at least in part, on the scores.

Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. For example, Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al. do not disclose or suggest assigning, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, scores to sentence endings, which include text that is located within identified sentences between a text fragment and an end of the identified sentences, based, at least in part, on a location within the identified sentences at which the text fragment occurs, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner admitted that Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 1 (Office Action, page 9). The Examiner alleged, however, that Goodwin et al. discloses these features of claim 1, and cited column 20, lines 16-39, of Goodwin et al. for support (Office Action, page 10). Applicants submit that the disclosure of Goodwin et al. provides no support for the Examiner's allegation.

At column 20, lines 16-39, Goodwin et al. discloses:

> In some embodiments, K-map information retrieval system 600 may display a search score 619 (e.g., a number between 1 and 100) with each of the documents in the search results, and may list the documents in an order based on this score. A document with a high score, for example, may be the most relevant to the search terms. The search engine may use various mechanisms for scoring and ranking as would be apparent. In one embodiment, the ranking may depend, for example, on the size of the document being searched, the number of matches, and the location of the matches within the document. For example, a large document with two matches, one in the beginning and one in the middle of the document, may be assigned a lower score than a smaller document with two matches at the beginning of the document. According to one embodiment, system 100 may use statistical data on word usage frequency to make sure that words like "a," "the," or "of" have less or no weight than those that are less frequently used.

> In one embodiment, documents 612 may include rankings for relevancy of
> information. In other embodiments, documents 612 may include scores for
> relevancy of information. A ranking may be derived by the system 600 based on
> its advanced metrics and analysis services that relate one or more person's activity
> with documents to determine value.

In this section, Goodwin et al. discloses that a search engine uses various mechanisms for ranking a document, such as the size of the document, the number of matches, and the location of the matches within the document. Thus, Goodwin et al. discloses that the location of the search term matches within the document (i.e., whether the matches occur at the beginning of the document, the middle of the document, or the end of the document) is considered in ranking the document. Simply determining whether a search term matches in the beginning, middle, or end of a document is a very different function than determining where a text fragment occurs within a sentence. Thus, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the search term of Goodwin et al. reasonably corresponds to a text fragment (a point that Applicants do not concede), Goodwin et al. is completely silent with regard to determining where a search term matches within a sentence. Therefore, Goodwin et al. does not disclose or suggest assigning, using a processor associated with the one or more server or client devices, scores to sentence endings, which include text that is located within identified sentences between a text fragment and an end of the identified sentences, based, at least in part, on a location within the identified sentences at which the text fragment occurs, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 2-6, 12-19, 24, 25, 27, and 29 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Claims 7, 26, and 28 have been amended to depend from claim 30, 31, and 41, respectively. Applicants submit that claims 7, 26, and 28 are patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons given below with regard to claims 30, 31, and 41, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 12-19, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON SHANAHAN ET AL., GOODWIN ET AL., AND ORTEGA ET AL.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al., Goodwin et al., and Ortega et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Initially, claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of Ortega et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. Therefore, claims 21 and 22 are patentable over Shanahan et al., Goodwin et al., and Ortega et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Claims 21 and 22 are also patentable for reasons of their own. Claim 22, for example, recites assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity is based, at least in part, on a number of times that the sentence endings occur within the one or more documents. Shanahan et al., Goodwin et al., and Ortega et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest these features.

The Examiner admitted that Shanahan et al. does not disclose these features (Office

Action, page 17). The Examiner alleged that Ortega et al. discloses "search query for auto-

completion for 'popular' items with frequency calculation for popularity determination, and

presentation to user," and cited column 4, lines 15-28, of Ortega et al. for support (Office Action,

page 17). Applicants submit that the Examiner has not addressed the features of claim 22 and,

therefore, did not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 22. Applicants

also submit that Ortega et al. does not disclose or suggest assigning scores to the sentence

endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings,

where the measure of popularity is based, at least in part, on a number of times that the sentence

endings occur within the one or more documents, as recited in claim 22.

At column 4, lines 15-28, Ortega et al. discloses:

If the database 22 is large (e.g., over one million items), the dataset generation
task is preferably performed such that the autocompletion strings suggested
generally correspond to the items and/or the search stings that are currently the
most "popular." For example, if Pokemon products are currently the best selling
items within the database 22, the term POKEMON may be suggested whenever a
user enters the letters "PO," even though many hundreds of other items in the
database may have names that start with "PO." One method for achieving this
goal is to monitor the browsing (and if applicable, purchasing) activities of users
to identify the most popular items, and to then parse such items to identify
characterizing terms and/or phrases. FIG. 6 provides one example of this method.

In this section, Ortega et al. discloses an autocompletion function that suggests strings that

correspond to items and/or search strings that are the most popular. Ortega et al. discloses using

information regarding browsing and purchasing activities to determine whether an item is

popular. Ortega et al. does not disclose or suggest a measure of popularity based on the number

of times that a sentence ending occurs within a set of documents. Thus, Ortega et al. does not

disclose or suggest assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure

of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity is based, at least in part, on <u>a number of times that the sentence endings occur within the one or more documents,</u> as recited in claim 22.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u>, <u>Goodwin et al.</u>, and <u>Ortega et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Shanahan et al.</u>, <u>Goodwin et al.</u>, and <u>Ortega et al.</u>

<div align="center">

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON
<u>SHANAHAN ET AL.</u> AND <u>ORTEGA ET AL.</u>

</div>

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u> and <u>Ortega et al.</u> Applicants traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 30 is directed to a system that comprises one or more devices comprising means for receiving a text fragment; means for identifying documents that include the text fragment; means for locating sentences within the documents that include at least some of the text fragment; means for identifying sentence endings associated with the located sentences, where the sentence endings include text that is located within the located sentences between the at least some of the text fragment and an end of the located sentences; means for assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity associated with one of the sentence endings is based, at least in part, on a number of times that the one of the sentence

endings occurs within the documents; and means for presenting the sentence endings as potential completions for the text fragment based, at least in part, on the scores.

Shanahan et al. and Ortega et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 30. For example, Shanahan et al. and Ortega et al. do not disclose or suggest means for assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity associated with one of the sentence endings is based, at least in part, on a number of times that the one of the sentence endings occurs within the documents, as recited in claim 30.

The Examiner admitted that Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest means for assigning scores to sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings (Office Action, page 18). The Examiner alleged, however, that Ortega et al. discloses "search query for auto-completion for 'popular' items with frequency calculation for popularity determination, and presentation to user," and cited column 4, lines 15-28, of Ortega et al. for support (Office Action, page 18). Applicants submit that the Examiner has not addressed the features of claim 30 and, therefore, did not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 30. Applicants also submit that Ortega et al. does not disclose or suggest means for assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity associated with one of the sentence endings is based, at least in part, on a number of times that the one of the sentence endings occurs within the documents, as recited in claim 30.

At column 4, lines 15-28 (reproduced above), <u>Ortega et al.</u> discloses an autocompletion function that suggests strings that correspond to items and/or search strings that are the most popular. <u>Ortega et al.</u> discloses using information regarding browsing and purchasing activities to determine whether an item is popular. <u>Ortega et al.</u> does not disclose or suggest a measure of popularity based on the number of times that a sentence ending occurs within a set of documents. Thus, <u>Ortega et al.</u> does not disclose or suggest means for assigning scores to the sentence endings based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the sentence endings, where the measure of popularity associated with one of the sentence endings is based, at least in part, on <u>a number of times that the one of the sentence endings occurs within the documents</u>, as recited in claim 30.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 30 is patentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u> and <u>Ortega et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Dependent claim 43 recites that the one or more servers are further to assign scores to the plurality of the sentence completions based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the plurality of the sentence completions and a location within the located sentences at which the at least a portion of the text fragment occurs.

<u>Shanahan et al.</u> and <u>Ortega et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 43. The Examiner alleged that <u>Ortega et al.</u> discloses "search query for auto-completion for 'popular' items with frequency calculation for popularity determination, and presentation to user," and cited column 4, lines 15-28, of <u>Ortega et al.</u> for support (Office Action, page 19). Applicants submit that the Examiner has not addressed the features of claim 43 and, therefore, did not establish a prima facie case of

obviousness with regard to claim 43. Applicants also submit that Ortega et al. does not disclose

or suggest one or more servers that are further to assign scores to the plurality of the sentence

completions based, at least in part, on a measure of popularity associated with the plurality of the

sentence completions and a location within the located sentences at which the at least a portion

of the text fragment occurs, as recited in claim 43, for at least reasons similar to the reasons

given with regard to claim 30.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 43 is patentable over Shanahan et

al. and Ortega et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection of claims 30 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Shanahan et al.

and Ortega et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON SHANAHAN ET AL.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 31 is directed to a system that comprises one or more servers to

receive a text fragment, where the text fragment includes a plurality of words, identify

documents that include at least a portion of the text fragment, locate sentences within the

documents that include the at least a portion of the text fragment, determine sentence

completions associated with the located sentences, where the sentence completions include text

that is located within the located sentences between the at least a portion of the text fragment and

an end of the located sentences, trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more

words from the one of the sentence completions, and provide a plurality of the sentence

completions including the trimmed sentence completion as potential completions for the text fragment.

Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 31. For example, Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest one or more servers to trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words from the one of the sentence completions, where the sentence completions include text that is located within the located sentences between at least a portion of the text fragment and an end of the located sentences and are associated with located sentences within documents that include the at least a portion of the text fragment, as recited in claim 31.

The Examiner admitted that Shanahan et al. does not disclose trimming one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words from the one of the sentence completions (Office Action, page 24). The Examiner alleged that Shanahan et al. discloses trimming at column 35, line 56 – column 36, line 2, and discloses dropping words from documents at column 36, lines 24-25 (Office Action, page 24). The Examiner also took Official Notice that words in a document may comprise sentence endings (Office Action, page 24). Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 31.

At column 35, line 56 – column 36, line 2, Shanahan et al. discloses:

> The enrichment information can be filtered using any number of known techniques. For example in one embodiment, enrichment information is filtered with respect to a domain specific corpus using Zipf's Law. Zipf's law, which is known in the art, concerns the distribution of different words in a text object and states that the product of a feature's frequency (where Zipf's law is generalized from words to text features other than and including words) in a text object, f, and its rank, r, is a constant, c(i.e., f*r=c). Bearing in mind this law, words having a low frequency will not be that interesting to the reader. In addition, words that have a high frequency will not be of interest either. Consequently, enrichment

-22-

information is reduced by eliminating information that occurs frequently or very rarely.

In this section, Shanahan et al. discloses that Zipf's law concerns the distribution of different words in a text object and states that the product of a feature's frequency in a text object and its rank is a constant. The Examiner appears to believe that this disclosure by Shanahan et al. reasonably corresponds to trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. There is absolutely no merit to the Examiner's allegation. There is nothing in this section that even remotely discloses or suggests trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. Thus, Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest one or more servers to trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words from the one of the sentence completions, where the sentence completions include text that is located within the located sentences between at least a portion of the text fragment and an end of the located sentences and are associated with located sentences within documents that include the at least a portion of the text fragment, as recited in claim 31.

At column 36, lines 24-25, Shanahan et al. discloses that the ranked information can include the closest one hundred words surrounding the ranked information. The Examiner appears to believe that this disclosure by Shanahan et al. reasonably corresponds to trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. There is absolutely no merit to the Examiner's allegation. There is nothing in this section that even remotely discloses or suggests trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. Thus, Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest one or more servers to trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words from the one of the sentence completions, where the sentence completions include text that is located within the

located sentences between at least a portion of the text fragment and an end of the located

sentences and are associated with located sentences within documents that include the at least a

portion of the text fragment, as recited in claim 31.

With regard to the Examiner's Official Notice that "words in a document may comprise

sentence endings," Applicants submit that the Examiner's Official Notice falls short of curing the

deficiencies in the disclosure of Shanahan et al. identified above. For example, the mere fact that

documents include words that form sentence endings falls short of establishing that Shanahan et

al. discloses, or even remotely suggests, trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or

more words from the sentence completion. Thus, Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest

one or more servers to trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words

from the one of the sentence completions, where the sentence completions include text that is

located within the located sentences between at least a portion of the text fragment and an end of

the located sentences and are associated with located sentences within documents that include

the at least a portion of the text fragment, as recited in claim 31.

The Examiner also cited column 57, lines 43-62, of Shanahan et al. for allegedly

disclosing the above-identified features of claim 31. Applicants disagree.

At column 57, lines 43-62, Shanahan et al. discloses:

> It will be appreciated by those skilled in the art that when using the method
> outlined in FIG. 45 for populating the auto-completion entity database, the entity
> database can grow to be prohibitively large, therefore, some entity selection
> algorithms should be used at 4510 to select which entities will provide the most
> benefit to the user in terms of time saved through auto-completion of these
> entities. For example, text based entities could be selected based on the length or
> the utility of the entity or combination of these.
>
> Alternatively, utility measures such as Zipf s law could be used for entity
> selection.

Zipf's law, which is well know in the art, concerns the distribution of different words in a corpus such as the information space surrounding a document, the online content available through the World Wide Web or some other domain specific corpus or a combination of the aforementioned. Zipf's law states that the product of a word's rank (r) and frequency (f) is a constant (C) i.e. r*f=C. Consequently, words/phrases that occur very rarely may ignored by the auto-completion system.

In this section, Shanahan et al. discloses a technique for selecting entities for the auto-completion entity database and discloses that words/phrases that occur very rarely may be ignored by the auto-completion system. The Examiner appears to believe that this disclosure by Shanahan et al. reasonably corresponds to trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. There is absolutely no merit to the Examiner's allegation. There is nothing in this section that even remotely discloses or suggests trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion. Thus, Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest one or more servers to trim one of the sentence completions by dropping one or more words from the one of the sentence completions, where the sentence completions include text that is located within the located sentences between at least a portion of the text fragment and an end of the located sentences and are associated with located sentences within documents that include the at least a portion of the text fragment, as recited in claim 31.

Further, the Examiner alleged that:

it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of Goodwin with Shanahan's display of completions with Shanahan's trimmings as pertaining to sentence endings with regard to Shanahan's sentence endings auto-completion, providing the benefit of efficient space utilization, wherein if the user has space display restrictions, an efficient method of designating the sentence endings and then truncating based on maximum number of words in context to display allows for efficient space preservation, and providing for only developing an entity database that includes words having a frequency that would be interesting to a reader

(Office Action, pages 24-25). Applicants submit that the Examiner's reasons for modifying the disclosure of <u>Shanahan et al.</u> lack merit. Initially, Applicants note that the Examiner's reasons include a reference to <u>Goodwin et al.</u> even though <u>Goodwin et al.</u> was not used in the rejection of claim 31.

Further, Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement of an alleged benefit of the modification. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Applicants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner provided no such articulated reasoning as required by KSR.

Also, the Examiner has not explained how trimming a sentence completion by dropping one or more words from the sentence completion would provide efficient space utilization if the user has space display restrictions. Therefore, the Examiner's allegation falls short of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 31.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u> Claim 32 depends from claim 31 and is, therefore, patentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 31.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Shanahan et al.</u>

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON
SHANAHAN ET AL. AND VEALE

In paragraph 5 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Veale. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 41 is directed to a computer device that comprises a memory to store instructions; and a processor to execute the instructions in the memory to obtain a fragment of text, search for documents that include at least a portion of the fragment of text, identify sentences within the documents that include the at least the portion of the fragment of text, determine sentence completions as text located within the identified sentences between the at least the portion of the fragment of text and an end of the identified sentences, merge at least two of the sentence completions to form a single merged sentence completion, and provide a plurality of the sentence completions, including the merged sentence completion, as potential completions for the fragment of text.

Shanahan et al. and Veale, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 41. For example, Shanahan et al. and Veale do not disclose or suggest a processor to merge at least two sentence completions, associated with identified sentences within documents that include at least a portion of a fragment of text, to form a single merged sentence completion, as recited in claim 41.

The Examiner admitted that Shanahan et al. does not disclose or suggest these features (Office Action, page 26). The Examiner alleged, however, that Veale discloses these features of claim 41, and cited column 21, line 35 - column 22, line 7, of Veale for support (Office Action,

page 26). Applicants submit that the disclosure of <u>Veale</u> provides no support for the Examiner's allegation.

At column 21, line 35 - column 22, line 7, <u>Veale</u> discloses that a composite answer is produced by combining answer fragments into a single answer. <u>Veale</u> discloses combining multiple, partial answers to form a more complete single answer (col. 22, lines 60-62). <u>Veale</u> provides an example of a composite answer as "[May 21] Cherie Blair, wife of prime minister Tony Blair, gave birth to a boy, Leo, today at St. Alban's Mercy hospital in London," which is a combination of the answer fragment "May 21" and the answer fragment "Cherie Blair, wife of prime minister Tony Blair, gave birth to a boy, Leo, today at St. Alban's Mercy hospital in London" (col. 22, lines 1-7). <u>Veale</u> does not disclose or suggest sentence completions that include text located within identified sentences between at least a portion of a fragment of text and an end of the identified sentences. Rather, <u>Veale</u> discloses composite answers constructed from multiple partial answers. Thus, <u>Veale</u> does not disclose or suggest a processor that is configured to merge at least two sentence completions, associated with identified sentences within documents that include at least a portion of a fragment of text, to form a single merged sentence completion, as recited in claim 41.

The Examiner admitted that the Examiner "only relies on Veale for the composite, or merging of answers, wherein the answers, are interpreted as the sentence completions as taught by Shanahan . . . Thus, the combination would produce merged auto-completion entities, as a composite answer to the user input" (Office Action, pages 6-7). Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegations lack merit. As explained above, <u>Veale</u> does not disclose or remotely suggest merging sentence completions. Rather, <u>Veale</u> discloses composite answers constructed

from multiple partial answers (col. 22, lines 60-62). The Examiner's allegation that combining the composite answers of <u>Veale</u> with the system of <u>Shanahan et al.</u> would derive a system that merges at least two sentence completions to form a single merged sentence completion is based solely on impermissible hindsight.

Further, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious "to modify Shanahan's completion suggestions with Veale's merged completion suggestions, providing the benefit of providing a composite answer <u>if required</u>" (emphasis added) (Office Action, page 26). Applicants submit that the Examiner's reason for combining <u>Veale</u> and <u>Shanahan et al.</u> lacks merit and is based solely on impermissible hindsight.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement of an alleged benefit of the modification. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Applicants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner provided no such articulated reasoning as required by KSR.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 41 is patentable over <u>Shanahan et al.</u> and <u>Veale</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Shanahan et al.</u> and <u>Veale</u>.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON
SHANAHAN ET AL., VEALE, AND ORTEGA ET AL.

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Veale and Ortega et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 44 depends from claim 41. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with

regard to claim 44, Applicants submit that the disclosure of Ortega et al. does not cure the

deficiencies in the disclosures of Shanahan et al. and Veale identified above with regard to claim

41. Therefore, claim 44 is patentable over Shanahan et al., Veale, and Ortega et al., whether

taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim

41.

Accordingly, Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of

claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Shanahan et al., Veale, and Ortega et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) BASED ON
SHANAHAN ET AL., GOODWIN ET AL., AND RISVIK

In paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shanahan et al. in view of Goodwin et al. and Risvik.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with

regard to claims 9-11, Applicants submit that the disclosure of Risvik does not cure the

deficiencies in the disclosures of Shanahan et al. and Goodwin et al. identified above with regard

to claim 1. Therefore, claims 9-11 are patentable over Shanahan et al., Goodwin et al., and

Risvik, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Shanahan et al., Goodwin et al., and Risvik.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of claims 1-7, 9-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 41, and 43-45.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner believes that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to discuss any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Paul A. Harrity, Reg. No. 39574/
     Paul A. Harrity
     Reg. No. 39,574

Date: June 3, 2009

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800